UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,271	02/17/2004	Philip C. Hodge	110308-0001	2235

39905	7590	08/14/2006

ROETZEL AND ANDRESS
222 SOUTH MAIN STREET
AKRON, OH 44308

EXAMINER
STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/780,271	HODGE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert Stevens	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 February 2004_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-56_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-56_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _08 November 2004_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _05192004_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1.   The Office acknowledges the Information Disclosure Statement filed 2/9/2004,

however two references were not considered: a) Chan (cited as US 6,663,892) and b)

Meier (cited as WO 02/41170 A2).

The Chan US Patent reference has not been considered because the cited

Document number does not match the Name and Publication Date. It was unclear what

Applicant intended to cite.

The Meier foreign patent reference has not been considered because: The

information disclosure statement filed 2/9/2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2),

which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent

literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information

or that portion which caused it to be listed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   **Claims 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101** because the claimed invention

is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

To be statutory, a claimed computer-related process must either: (A) result in a physical transformation outside the computer for which a practical application is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (B) be limited to a practical application with useful, concrete and tangible result.

Independent claim 20 is directed to software per se and is not tangibly embodied. One way to correct the claim language is to recite the application's storage on a computer readable medium.

Claims 21-26 are dependent upon claim 20, and are therefore likewise rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   **Claims 1, 6, 14, 19, 33-34, 40 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)** as

being anticipated by Kim et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0120729,

filed as a continuation of Application no. 08/908544, which was filed on Aug. 7, 1997

and published on Jan. 26, 2003, hereafter referred to as "Kim").

Regarding independent claim 1: Kim discloses

A data-management system to be provided to a digital computer terminal

for generating a link in real time between an electronic document opened in a

computer application and a target document, said digital computer terminal

comprising a computer readable memory and a data-capture device, (See the

Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation

between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon

scanning a document into a target file digital format) **said data-management system**

comprising: data-capture logic for controlling capture of electronic data by said

data-capture device; (See Figure 4 #4 in Kim, showing the use of a scanner.) **target-**

document logic for generating said target document from said electronic data;

and (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax

and creating a file.)

link-generating logic for substantially simultaneously storing said target

document in said computer readable memory and generating said link to said

target document in said electronic document in real time. (See paragraphs [0012] –

[0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that

paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being retrieved.)

Regarding claim 6: Kim teaches wherein the application is a browser. (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing an image link to an HTML page, which is inherently displayed in a browser.)

Regarding claim 14: Kim teaches wherein the target is an image. (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing an input image link.)

Regarding claim 19: Kim teaches the use of hyperlinks. (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing an HTML link.)

Regarding independent claim 33: Kim discloses

A data-management system for linking a portion of an electronic document to a target document, (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing linking an input image) **said data-management system comprising: a data-capture device for capturing electronic data representing an information object;** (See Figure 4 #4 in Kim, showing the use of a scanner.) **means for generating said target document from said electronic data;** (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to

a scanner or fax and creating a file.) **a computer readable memory to store said**

target document; and (See paragraph [0014] in Kim, which discusses the retrieval of

the created image file, which required that the file be stored before being retrieved. It is

inherent that such data storage required a computer readable memory.) **means for**

substantially simultaneously storing said target document in said computer

readable memory and generating a link to said target document in said electronic

document. (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link

generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the

created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being

retrieved.)

Regarding claim 34: Kim teaches the use of a scanner. (See paragraph [0012]

of Kim.)

Regarding independent claim 40: Kim discloses

An electronic-document management method for creating and managing

an electronic document having a link to a target document in a computer

application, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing

automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a

browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format) **said**

method comprising the steps of: generating said target document from

electronic data representing an information object captured by a data-capture

device; and (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a

scanner or fax and creating a file object.) **substantially simultaneously storing said**

target document in a computer readable memory and generating said link at said

user-selected location in said electronic document. (See paragraphs [0012] –

[0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that

paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required

that the file be stored before being retrieved.)

Regarding independent claim 56: Kim discloses

A data-management system for generating a hyperlink in real time between

a portion of an electronic document opened in a computer application and a

target document, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing

automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a

browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an

obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than

one link.) **said system comprising: a digital computer terminal comprising a**

computer readable memory and a data-capture device; (See Figure 2 #88 and #82

of Kim) data-capture logic in communication with said digital computer terminal for

controlling capture of electronic data by said data-capture device; (See The Kim Figure

2 #80, 81 and 82, in context of paragraph [0012] discussing the use of a scanner.)

target-document logic in communication with said digital computer terminal for

generating said target document from said electronic data; and (See the Abstract

of Kim, discussing generation of a target document via a scanning process for display in

a browser.) **link-generating logic in communication with said digital computer**

terminal for substantially simultaneously storing said target document in said

computer readable memory and generating said link to said target document in

said electronic document in real time. (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] –

[0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML

document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file

digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to include more than one link.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   **Claims 2-5, 7-13, 15-18, 20-32, 35-39 and 41-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.**

103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US Patent Application Publication No.

2003/0120729, filed as a continuation of Application no. 08/908544, which was filed on

Aug. 7, 1997 and published on Jan. 26, 2003, hereafter referred to as "Kim") in view of

Ferguson et al. (US Patent No. 6,820,094, filed Oct. 8, 1997 and issued Nov. 16, 2004,

hereafter referred to as "Ferguson").

        Regarding claim 2: Kim teaches "transmitting" documents to storage. (See

paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing the storage of documents.) However,

Kim does not explicitly teach updating link paths. Ferguson, though, suggests this

limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data

storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving

updates requiring link elimination.)

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so

provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store,

search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson

in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e.,

the management of electronic documents.

Regarding claim 3: Kim does not explicitly teach the use of top-level directories and subfolders. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See Figure 3 and column 4 lines 59-67 in Ferguson, illustrating the use of top-level folder and subdirectories. The specific data one arranged in a hierarchy was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

Regarding claim 4: Kim teaches the use of hard disk data storage. (See Figure 1 #3 in Kim, showing a file server computer, it having been well-known in the art that file server computers contain a hard drive.

Regarding claim 5: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

Regarding claims 7-12: Kim does not explicitly teach the recited limitations. Ferguson, though, suggests these limitations. (See column 10 lines 9-11 in Ferguson, discussing the processing of multipage documents, and column 15 lines 34-40, discussing the linking of a plurality of documents to/from a compound document. Establishing links, whether in a 1:1, 1:MANY, MANY:1 or MANY:MANY fashion, was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

Regarding claim 13: Kim does not explicitly teach link removal. Ferguson,

though, suggests this limitation. (See column 7 lines 53-57 in Ferguson, discussing the

removal of only the link.)

Regarding claims 15-18: Kim does not explicitly teach the recited limitations.

Ferguson, though, suggests the use of an add-in. (See Figure 12 in Ferguson, showing

the display results for a browser application add-in.) Ferguson also suggests the use of

a data management system. (See the Abstract of Ferguson, discussing a document

management application program, it having been an obvious variant to one skilled in the

art at the time of the invention as to number of software modules and the location of

specific functionality in each module.) Ferguson also suggests link-editing/ updating.

(See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing the updating of an STG data storage

file.) Ferguson teaches the use of icons. (See column 12 lines 41-52 in Ferguson,

discussing the use of icons to represent links.)

Regarding independent claim 20: Kim discloses

A computer application for linking a portion of an electronic document to a

target document stored as electronic data representing an information object in a

computer accessible memory, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in

Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document

opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format) **said computer application comprising: link-generating logic for generating a link to said target document in said electronic document; and** (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation.) **data-management logic for transmitting said electronic document and said target document to a data storage device, wherein said data-management logic automatically updates a path of said link to render said link operable following said transmission.** (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being retrieved.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach updating link paths. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file.) Ferguson further suggests link-editing/ updating. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing the updating of an STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving updates requiring link elimination.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson

in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e.,

the management of electronic documents.

Claim 21 is substantially similar to claim 4, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 22: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though,

suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for

viewing and printing documents.)

Regarding claims 23-26: Kim does not explicitly teach the recited limitations.

Ferguson, though, suggests these limitations. (See column 10 lines 9-11, discussing

the processing of multipage documents, and column 15 lines 34-40, discussing the

linking of a plurality of documents to/from a compound document. Establishing links,

whether in a 1:1, 1:MANY, MANY:1 or MANY:MANY fashion, was an obvious variant to

one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

Regarding independent claim 27: Kim discloses

A data-management system for generating a plurality of links to target

documents in an electronic document, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] –

[0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML

document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file

digital format) **said data-management system comprising: means for creating and**

editing said electronic document; means for generating a plurality of target

documents from electronic data captured by a data-capture device; (See

paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and

creating a file object.) **means for storing said plurality of captured target**

documents in a computer readable memory; and means for generating a link at a

plurality of user-selected locations in said electronic document to said plurality of

captured target documents. (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing

automatic link generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses

retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before

being retrieved.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach editing, generation of a plurality of

documents or use of sequential identifiers. Ferguson, though, suggests editing. (See

column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions.)

Ferguson also suggests the generation of a plurality of target documents. (See column

15 lines 30-39 in Ferguson, discussing clipped documents being formed from a plurality

of documents such as images, Word documents and HTML files, and column 15 line 63

– column 16 line 6, discussing links to a compound document from each component

target document.) Ferguson further suggests the use of sequential identifiers for

targets. (See column 5 lines 1-15 in Ferguson, discussing the sequential numbering of

documents [e.g., D_1, D_2, etc.].)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so

provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store,

search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson

in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e.,

the management of electronic documents.

Regarding claim 28: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though,

suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for

viewing and printing documents.

Regarding claim 29: Kim teaches "transmitting" documents to storage. (See

paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing storage of documents.) However, Kim

does not explicitly teach updating link paths. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation.

(See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file,

in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving updates requiring link elimination.)

Claim 30 is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 31: Kim does not explicitly teach updating link paths. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving updates requiring link elimination.)

Regarding independent claim 32: Kim discloses

A system for linking a target document to a portion of an electronic document in real time (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing automatic link generation to a scanned document file), **said system comprising: a computer application for generating and editing said electronic document;** (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing the use of a scanner and generation of an electronic file.) **link-generating logic operable with said computer application for generating a link to said target document, wherein said target document is an electronic reproduction of a hardcopy document and is to be generated by scanning said hardcopy document with an optical data-capture device, further wherein said link is to be generated at approximately the same time as said captured target document is to be saved,**

and further wherein said computer application is one of a group consisting of a spreadsheet, word processor, database, presentation application, and any combination thereof. (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Ferguson, discussing a browser application and automatic link generation to an HTML page and storage, in context of [0005], discussing the scanning of paper documents using an optical data-capture device such as a scanner. It is noted that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which requires that the file be stored.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach editing. Ferguson, though, suggests editing. (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Claim 35 is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected. It is further noted that the exact "means" (e.g., hardware or software element) in which a particular functionality was implemented, was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.

Claims 36-37 are substantially similar to claims 3-4, respectively, and therefore

likewise rejected. It is further noted that the exact "means" (e.g., hardware or software

element) in which a particular functionality was implemented, was an obvious variant to

one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding claims 38-39: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson,

though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32, discussing a utility for

viewing and printing documents.)

Regarding claim 41: Kim does not explicitly teach document viewing.

Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See Figure 1 element #169 and column 11

lines 28-32 in Ferguson, discussing document viewing.

Regarding claim 42: Kim teaches "transmitting" documents to storage. (See

paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing storage of documents, it having been an

obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention as to whether a user

command was first required or such storage take place automatically.) However, Kim

does not explicitly teach updating link paths. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation.

(See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file,

in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving updates requiring

link elimination.)

Claim 43 is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 44: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though,

suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for

viewing and printing documents.)

Claim 45 is substantially similar to claim 18, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 46 is substantially similar to claim 17, and therefore likewise rejected. It is

further noted that manual intervention or automatic updating, were obvious variants in

light of each other to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding independent claim 47: Kim discloses

An electronic-document management method for creating and managing

an electronic document having a plurality of links to target documents in a

computer application, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim,

discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened

in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than one link.) **said method comprising the steps of: generating a plurality of target documents from electronic data representing one or more information objects captured by a data-capture device;** (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file object.) **generating one or more links to the target documents in said electronic document.** (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than one link.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach **editing, generation of a plurality of documents or use of sequential identifiers**. Ferguson, though, suggests editing. (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions.) Ferguson also suggests the generation of a plurality of target documents. (See column 15 lines 30-39 in Ferguson, discussing clipped documents being formed from a plurality of documents such as images, Word documents and HTML files, and column 15 line 63 – column 16 line 6, discussing links to a compound document from each component target document.) Ferguson further suggests the use of sequential identifiers for targets. (See column 5 lines 1-15 in Ferguson, discussing the sequential numbering of documents [e.g., D_1, D_2, etc.].)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so

provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store,

search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson

in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e.,

the management of electronic documents.

Claims 48-49 are substantially similar to claim 42 and claim 3, respectively, and

therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 50: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though,

suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for

viewing and printing documents.)

Regarding claim 51: Kim does not explicitly teach the use of icons. Ferguson

teaches the use of icons. (See column 12 lines 41-52 in Ferguson, discussing the use

of icons to represent links.)

Regarding claim 52: Kim does not explicitly teach updating link paths.

Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson,

discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57,

discussing a scenario involving updates requiring link elimination.)

Regarding claim 53: Kim does not explicitly teach user selected link locations,

comparing the number of locations with the number of documents to be linked and

generating a link for each document. Ferguson, though, suggests these limitations.

(See column 9 lines 51-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the importing documents,

and column 9 lines 27-31, discussing the linking of multiple documents.)

Claims 54-55 are substantially similar to claims 24-25, respectively, and

therefore likewise rejected.

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Non-patent Literature

Flynn, Mike, et al., "The Satchel System Architecture: Mobile Access to Documents and Services", Mobile Networks and Applications, Vol. 5, Baltzer Science Publishers BV, © 2000, pp. 243-258.

Thoma, G. R., et al., "A Prototype System for the Electronic Storage and Retrieval of Document Images", ACM Transactions on Office Information Systems, Vol. 3, No. 3, Jul. 1985, pp. 279-291.

Myka, Andreas, et al., "HyperFacs – Building and Using a Digitized Paper Library", ACM SIGLINK Newsletter, Vol. IV, No. 2, Sep. 1995, pp. 4-6.

Bell, Gordon, "A Personal Digital Store", Communications of the ACM, Vol. 44, No. 1, Jan. 2001, pp. 86-91.

Candler, James W., et al., "The ORION Project: Staged Business Process Reengineering at FedEx", Communications of the ACM, Vol. 39, No. 2, Feb. 1996, pp. 99-107.

Kindberg, Tim, "Implementing Physical Hyperlinks Using Ubiquitous Identifier Resolution", WWW 2002, Honolulu, HI, May 7-11, 2002, pp. 191-199.

Blustein, James, "Automatically Generated Hypertext Versions of Scolarly Articles and Their Evaluation", Hypertext 2000, San Antonio, TX, © 2000, pp. 201-210.

Myka, A., et al., "Monitoring User Actions in the Hypertext System 'HyperMan'", SIGDOC '92, ACM 089791-533-X/92/0010/0103, © 1992, pp. 103-113.

US Patent Application Publications

Yamade et al	2003/0107777

US Patents

Chalstrom et al	6,633,913
Brusky et al	6,604,157
Hsu et al	6,574,644
Embry et al	6,094,689

Contact Information

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The current fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-

872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-

2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert Stevens
Art Unit 2162
Date: July 23, 2006

rs

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER